REMARKS:

Claims 15 and 17-33 are presented for examination, with claim 28 having been amended hereby and claims 1-14 and 16 having been previously cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 28 has been amended to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner at page 2 of the November 30, 2005 Office Action. More particularly, claim 28 has been amended hereby to recite "selected from the group consisting of".

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 15, 19, 22 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella" and "Miller".

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of claims 15, 19, 22 and 33 of the present application and the "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella" and "Miller" references.

However, in an effort to expedite prosecution (and to try to reduce the number of outstanding issues), applicant will focus the following discussion on the single pending independent claim (claim 15). More particularly, applicant will focus on the claim element directed to "inputting data regarding a requirement that the bond issuer establish revenue rates sufficient to pay the repayment obligation by the expected payment date".

In this regard, it is noted that the claim specifically recites the step of inputting data regarding a requirement that the bond issuer establish revenue rates sufficient to pay the repayment obligation by the expected payment date.

It is respectfully submitted that "Bella" (which is relied upon by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing this element) simply fails to disclose such a requirement.

Rather, what is described in the "Bella" reference is simply a rate recommendation, not a requirement (that is, the council members have the option of considering various rate structures and are nowhere said to be required to establish revenue rates sufficient to pay a repayment obligation by an expected payment date).

In fact, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner himself actually implicitly recognizes this distinction between "Bella" and the claimed invention when discussing "Bella" at page 24 of the November 30, 2005 Office Action and stating the following:

> While the bond issuer in Bella debates how fast or how gradually to raise the rates, the bond issuer must still generate sufficient revenue to repay the revenue bonds by the expected payment date, as outside funds are excluded from use, and, therefore, is required to set a revenue rate sufficient to generate sufficient revenue by said date. If insufficient funds were generated by the project to repay the revenue bonds by the expected payment date, the bond issuer would be in default, as is the nature of bonds and repayment obligations. Therefore, the bond issuer is required to set revenue rates sufficient to pay the repayment obligation or risk default. (emphasis added)

That is, as the Examiner indicates, the choice is provided in "Bella" to set appropriate rates or risk default (as is the conventional nature of such bonds and repayment obligations).

In marked contrast, the claimed invention is configured to distinguish itself from such conventional bonds and repayment obligations and incorporates a requirement that the bond issuer establish revenue rates sufficient to pay the repayment obligation by the expected payment date. The present invention (as claimed) thus eliminates the risk of default in this regard (to the extent that the bond issuer actually follows through on the requirement recited in the claim).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 15, 19, 22 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella" and "Miller" has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella" and "Miller" and further in view of various additional references.

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23-32 of the present application and the "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella", "Miller" and various other references.

Nevertheless, it is noted that each of claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23-32 depends (directly or indirectly) from independent claim 15. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23-32 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Livingston", "Financial Post", "Bella" and "Miller" and further in view of various additional references has been overcome.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection raised by the Examiner in the

November 30, 2005 Office Action has been overcome and that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

Finally, it is noted that this Amendment is fully supported by the originally filed application and thus, no new matter has been added. For this reason, the Amendment should be entered.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
GREENBERG TRAURIG

Dated: February 28, 2006

By: 
Matthew B. Tropper
Registration No. 37,457

Mailing Address:
GREENBERG TRAURIG
MetLife Building
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
(212) 801-2100
Facsimile: (212) 801-6400